

Evidence on the Ethnic Division of the Hurrians

I. M. DIAKONOFF
Institut Vostokovedenija
Leningrad, U.S.S.R

In the literature on the Hurrians¹ it has been repeatedly stated that no proof of any dialectal division in the Hurrian language exists. If that were so, the Hurrians must have been an undivided ethnic unity. Such a unity might have emerged either as the result of inhabiting a particular area under uniform socio-political conditions for a very considerable period of time (hundreds or even thousands of years), or the result of a recent and swift occupation of an area by an ethnic mass having developed as a unity elsewhere. Neither of the hypotheses looks plausible from the historical point of view.

In his Hurrian glossary E. Laroche seems to reject any possibility of identifying dialects in Hurrian.² His position is no doubt justified by the present level of our knowledge of the Hurrian vocabulary: what we actually know is a very limited number of specific, mainly cultic word items which by no means necessarily do or can reflect dialectal differences that may have existed in the living language. We must also take into consideration that the degree of the reliability of the translation of nearly all Hurrian words is still very low.

However, there are also other means to establish the existence of ethnic subdivisions (tribes?) among the Hurrians. One of them is by means of morphology. Miss M. L. Khačikyan³ has plainly shown, that unlike the

¹I. M. Diakonoff, *Hurrisch und Urartäisch*, München 1971, p. 23 (in the following quoted as *HuU*); E. A. Speiser, "Introduction to Hurrian," *AASOR* 20, New Haven, 1941, and others.

²E. Laroche, "Glossaire de la langue hurrite, I" partie (A-L)," *RHA* 34 (1976), p. 23. Note that, with all respect to Laroche's masterful and incomparable knowledge of the Hurrian material proper, the Urartian analogies cited in his glossary are insufficient and unreliable, being, e.g., sometimes quoted in an oblique case. Also, Laroche's (and most other Hurritologists') refusal to accept Speiser's reconstruction of a Hurrian **o*-phoneme makes it difficult to understand the structure of Hurrian and Urartian grammatical oppositions.

³M. L. Khačikyan, "Iz starokhurritskikh zaklinanij [From Old Hurrian Incantations]," *Hin Aravelk' - Drevnij Vostok* 2, Erevan 1976, pp. 251-64; eadem,

vocabulary, the morphonological inventory of the Hurrian texts and the use of the syntagmatic enclitic conjunctions change very perceptibly from one text group to another. Thus, in the field of grammar the features of a clear-cut dialectal division are readily apparent. Miss Khačikyan has presented these features in tabular form. Without repeating her table, we shall summarize her results in establishing Hurrian dialectal units on morphological and syntactical levels by grouping them according to their typical classifying features (in so far as these are known). The features, according to Khačikyan, are as follows:

I. *Urartian language* (9th-6th centuries B.C.) *Noun*: relics of a 1st directive case in **-ta*, replacement of the 2nd directive case **-di* by the postposition **edi*, locative in *-a*. *Pronouns*: possessive 3rd p. *-(i)'ja*, *-ij(ə)*, demonstrative **a(l)le*, subject-of-the-state (=object) pronoun 3 p. *-nə*.⁴ *Verb*: 3rd p.Sg. of the subject of action, indicative *-Ø*, *-a*, 3p.Sg. of the subject of state (=object) *-ne* (Pl.-*lə*), plural morphs *-it-*, *-a(š)-*, no negative conjugation, morph of transitivity *-i/-u*, of non-transitivity **-o*, of state *-a*. *Predicative participles*: transitive *-i*, non-transitive **-a-bə*,⁵ state *-a*. Non-transitive predicate expressed by verbal form (in distinction from all other dialects which use only predicative participles). No syntagmatic enclitic conjunctions.

II. *Dialect of the inscription from Urkiš*⁶ (ca. 22nd century B.C.) *Pronouns*: possessive 3rd p. *-(j)a*, demonstrative *halle*, subject-of-the-state (=object) 3rd p. *-en*, *-m(e)*. *Verb*: 3rd p.Sg. of the subject of action, indicative *Ø*, 3rd p.Sg. of the subject of state (=object) *-m*, plural morph **-it(?)*, negation morph *-wa-*, morph of transitivity *-i/-u*. *Predicative participle* of action *-i*. No syntagmatic enclitic conjunctions. A number of classifying features not attested.

III. *Dialect of the texts from Mari and North-Eastern Babylonia* (published by F. Thureau-Dangin⁷ and J. J. Van Dijk,⁸ ca. 18th-16th centuries B.C.). *Noun*: 1st directive case *-da*, 2nd directive case *-di*, locative *-a*. *Pronouns*: possessive 3rd p. *-je*, demonstrative *a(n)na*, subject-of-the-state (=object) pronoun 3rd p. *-n*, *-b*. *Verb*: 3rd p.Sg. of the subject of action, indicative *-a*, plural morphs *-id-*, *-und-*, *-a(z)-*, morphs of negation *-wa-*, *-ma*, morph of transitivity *-i*, non-transitivity **-o*, state *-a*. *Predicative participles*: transitive *-i-b*, intransitive *-a-b*, state **-o*. Enclitic conjunctions.

"Dialektnoje členenije khurritskogo jazyka [Dialectal Subdivision of Hurrian]," *ibid.* 3, Erevan 1978, pp. 39-46.

⁴As part of the doubly-oriented conjugated transitive verbal form.

⁵Actually, in Urartian this is no longer a participle but a conjugated intransitive verbal form, 3rd person of the subject. — Note that the 3rd p. of the verb "to be" is **man-o*.

⁶Last discussion: *HuU*, pp. 110-11, n. 123.

⁷F. Thureau-Dangin, "Tablettes hurrites provenant de Mari," *RA* 36 (1939), 1-28.

⁸J. van Dijk, "Nichtkanonische Beschwörungen und sonstige literarische Texte," *VS NF* 1, 1971, Nos. 5-7, 20, 22, 26.

IV. *Dialect of S.-E. Asia Minor* (Kizzuwadna, Cataonia), attested from Boğazköy (14th-13th centuries B.C.). Coincides with (III), except for the following: *Pronouns*: possessive pronoun 3rd p. *-ja*, demonstrative *anne*, *Verb*: 3rd p. Sg. of the subject of action, indicative *-a*, *-ja*. The plural morph *-und-* is absent, negation in *-ma* doubtful. *Predicative participles* *-i*, *-a*, **-o*. Developed system of enclitic conjunctions.

V. *Mitannian dialect* (letter of Dušratta, ca. 1400 B.C.) coincides with (IV), except for the following: *Noun*: the 2nd directive case in **-di* is absent, the plural morph *-za* is typical. *Pronouns*: possessive pronoun 3rd p. *-(i)'ja*, *-(i)je*, subject-of-the-state (=object) pronoun 3rd p. *-(n)na*, *-ma(?)*, *-me-*. In the *predicative participles* *-b* appears only as a relic (in PN). Strong development of enclitic chains of conjunctions.

VI. *Ugaritic Hurrian dialect*⁹ (the language of the religious and literary texts and of letters, 14th-13th century B.C.) coincides with (V), except for the following: *Pronouns*: subject-of-the-state (=object) pronoun 3rd p., *-n*, *-ma*, *Verb*: 3rd Sg. of the subject of action *-a*, as in (II), plural morph *-it-* not attested; negative morph *-kk-*; uninterpreted verbal morph *-te*. Weaker development of enclitics.

VII. *Unidentified dialect*¹⁰ (language of the Hurrian text of the variant of HAR-ra = *hubulhu* from Ugarit, date and place of compilation unknown, date of the copy 14th-13th century B.C.) *Noun*: locative in *-e*, plural morph *-až(ə)*. *Pronouns*: possessive pronoun 3rd p. *-di*, subject-of-the-state (=object) pronoun 3rd p. *-ne(?)*. *Verb*: 3rd p.Sg. of the subject of action *-ja-*, negation morphs *-k(ə)*, *-m(ə)*, uninterpreted verbal morph *-te*. *Predicative participles*: *-i-ž(ə)*, *-a-ž(ə)*, **-o-ž(ə)*, pl. *-a-ž(ə)(?)*. Wide use of quasi-nominal forms in *-ae* ("gerundive" in all the other dialects) instead of the conjugated forms of the verb of action. Syntactic features unknown.

Thus, Miss Khačikyan's data clearly demonstrate that all Hurrian texts (except the glosses from Arraphe, Alalah, etc. which she did not study) belong to three clear-cut dialectal groups:

(A), or North-Eastern, includes (II) Urkiš, ca. 22nd century B.C. and (I) Urtarian, 9th-6th centuries B.C.;

(B), or Central, includes, as the most archaic, (III), "Babylonian" Hurrian of Thureau-Dangin's and Van Dijk's texts, 18th-16th centuries B.C., and also (IV-VI), the "Cataonian," Mitannian and Ugaritic Hurrian (all from the 14th-13th centuries B.C.), the latter three losing a number of archaic features. They are all very similar but clearly differ in details. The dialects of Arraphe and Alalah have been omitted, but it seems to us that Arraphean stands nearer to (III), and Alalah probably to (VI). We shall therefore denote these two dialects as (IIIa) and (VIa). — Note that all Indo-Iranian PNs and other "aryanisms"

⁹ *Ugaritica* 5, Paris 1968, pp. 519-27 (E. Laroche).

¹⁰ M. L. Khačikjan, "Šumero-khurritskij slovar' iz Ras-Šamry [A Sumero-Hurrian Vocabulary from Ras-Šamra]," *VDI*, 1975, 3, pp. 21-38.

belong exclusively to dialect (VI); this dialect was apparently also used by some dynasts of Palestine and Syria, probably tied by kinship to the Mitannian royal dynasty. Note also that Ugaritic Hurrian has some isoglosses connecting it with group (C), probably the result of territorial contiguity.

(C), or South-Western, includes the unidentified dialect (VII). The text which suggests its existence was found in Ugarit. However, it is improbable that it was actually spoken there because the dialect stands apart from all others and is very archaic. Thus, while A II has a verbal intransitive as well as a verbal transitive predicate, and the B-dialects have verbal transitive though not verbal intransitive predicates (the intransitive ones being virtually participles), C VII seems to have lacked even a developed transitive verb.

Another way to establish whether the Hurrians were ethnically a uniform mass or were subdivided into individual tribes or other ethnic units, may be a comparison of the pantheons. It is well known that from the time of the emergence of the state structure in the Ancient Near East the main organizational unit above the (extended or non-extended) family was the town or "nome" community; each had its own protecting deity and a circle of connected less important gods and goddesses. In the present case, however, we are not interested in the strictly local pantheons. Thus, the community "pantheons" in the different towns and villages of the kingdom of Arraphe as established by Deller,¹¹ were united in one regional pantheon of the entire kingdom. This can be seen from the uniform repertory of the theophorous PNs¹² and from the lists of deities receiving oil offerings.¹³ The latter include local gods who have their sanctuaries at Nuzi, the gods of the capital (Āl-ilāni), and deities who were worshipped in other towns of the kingdom. Likewise, the lists of Hurrian deities which have come down to us from Ugarit cannot be regarded as an enumeration of the gods whose places of worship were in the town of Ugarit itself. In this tiny place there was not space enough for so many sanctuaries (note that a number of non-Hurrian gods were also worshipped here). Very telling are the lists of deities involved as witnesses of mutual oaths in the treaties between Hittite and other kings.¹⁴ There was a tendency to enumerate a maximum of gods and goddesses able to safeguard the implementation of the oaths, although certain gods might have been left out for a specific reason (e.g., the "children" and "adolescents," or otherwise deities unimportant or unsuited for this particular task).

An interesting example is the list of deities in the treaty between Suppiluliumas, king of the Hittites, and Šattiwazza, king of Mitanni: from the

¹¹K. Deller, "Material zu den Lokalpanthea des Königreiches Arraphe," *Summarium (Compte rendu) de la XXI^{ème} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, pp. 33-45.

¹²See *NPN*.

¹³*SMN* 588, 491, 690, 799, 2153+2154 = *AASOR* 16, Nos. 46-50.

¹⁴E. F. Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien II*, Leipzig, 1923.

Hittite side the gods of the empire are invoked, among them the most revered of the community and "nome" deities. Most of them are Hattic but some are Indo-European (thus, along with the Hattic Sun-goddess of Arinna the Hittite-Luwian Sun-god is also mentioned),¹⁵ or Hurrian (thus, the Thunderer-god has been identified with the Hurrian Teššob, which follows from the fact that he is attended by the Hurrian bull-gods "Sunset and Sunrise" [Šeri and Hurri]¹⁶ and by the Hurrian mountain-gods "South and North" [Nanni and Ḫazzi]);¹⁷ moreover, included in the list are seventeen Thunderer-gods, differentiated either according to the sphere of life which each of them patronizes, or according to their places of worship (quite a number of them must have been Hurrian Teššobs; their real names are hidden under the sumerogram ^dIŠKUR); and there are four Ḫebats (the "Lady of Heavens," Ḫebat of Ḫaleb, Ḫebat of the town Uda, and Ḫebat of Kizzuwadna).

From the Mitannian side the deities are divided into three groups: (a) the gods of Kizzuwadna, (b) the gods, presumably, of Ḫarrān (anyway, Semitic gods), (c) Mitannian gods proper. For the purposes of this paper we may exclude the gods whose names are hapax legomena or who are obviously minor deities. Thus, from group (a) we exclude certain chthonic deities, possibly pre-Hurrian; from group (c) the local gods designated by epithets instead of proper names. Group (c) includes also a mention of certain Indo-Iranian gods (probably protectors of the dynasty): there is a Hurrian sentence wedged into the Akkadian text: "the Mithraic gods, the Varunian(?)¹⁸ gods, Indra, the gods Nāsatya." Further, it includes a number of Akkadian gods firmly rooted in most Hurrian pantheons (they are also mentioned in the mythological texts about the god Kumarwe and other texts of presumably Cataanian origin in the Boğazköy archives, and in the Ugaritic Hurrian lists of deities).

It should be noticed at once that the texts from Boğazköy mention also such gods that are not named among the deities witnessing the oath, either from the Hittite side or from the side of Mitanni (and Kizzuwadna). The

¹⁵G. Kellerman, "The King and the Sun-god in the Old Hittite period," *Tel-Aviv* 5, 3-4 (1978) pp. 199-207.

¹⁶*HuU*, p. 165¹⁰, 166²³.

¹⁷*Ḫa-zi-*, *Ḫa-az-zi-* (read /Ḫas(s)i-/) is the Hurrian name of Mount *Šapānu* which means "North"; presumably that is also the meaning of the Hurrian word. Seeing that *Šeri* and *Hurri*, as pointed out in n. 16, ref., means "Sunset and Sunrise," or "West and East," *Nanni* must mean "South."

¹⁸The original has "Urwanian (or 'Arunian') gods"; *Urwana-* and *Aruna-* are hard to explain from the Hurrian, and the Indo-Iranian scholars refuse to claim them for their own; the traditional translation "Varunian" has been accepted not on linguistic but on "common sense" grounds, because *Mitra-* and *Varuṇa-* are a constant pair in Old Indian literature (and the same should probably be said of the pre-Zoroastrian Iranian mythology). I am not fully convinced that the "common sense" argument is valid.

opinion which derives all Hurrian influence on Hatti from Kizzuwadna alone and dates it exclusively to the New Kingdom seems to be erroneous. A similar influence must have reached the Hittites from Išuwa, Alzi, etc. But the pantheon of Boğazköy is very syncretic and thus not suitable for the establishment of regional religious peculiarities. Our aim is not a characterization of the Hurrian world of deities.

The inscription from Urkiš is too short; it mentions only two gods who may not be the most important in the pantheon of the region. On the contrary, the incantations from Mari and those from northeastern Babylonia published by van Dijk seem indeed to invoke all the most important deities. Thus the data of the group (III) texts are comparable with the other sources. Among the Urartian texts we have a complete list of the official pantheon.¹⁹

Characteristic of the Hurri-Urartian cultural world is the inclusion in the pantheon of personifications of divine properties, of lakes, mountains, rivers, winds, clouds, etc.

Selecting only the most important and characteristic gods, we arrive at the following picture of the main regional pantheons:

I. *Urkiš*: The inscription mentions the gods *Ne-gal* (*Nergal*?) and *Lubadaga* (*Nubadig* of the Western Hurrians).

II. *Urartu*:²⁰ the supreme triad consists of the dynastic god *Haldi* (place of worship: Muşasir-Ardine) with his consort *Warubane* (otherwise *Bagbartu*, or *Bagmaštu*); the Thunderer-god *Teišebā* (= Hurr. *Teššob*, place of worship: K/Qumēnu or K/Qumme on the Upper Zab) with his consort *Hubā* (= Hurr. *Hebā*), and the Sun-god *Šiwine* (possibly of Hittite-Luwian origin, place of worship: Tušpā) with his consort *Tušpueā* (to his circle may belong the goddesses *Aui* and *Aia*; the latter belongs to the most ancient Near Eastern substratum; in Sippar she had the epithet *kallātum* and was the wife of the local Sun-god *Šamaš*). *Haldi* seems to be a newcomer to the pantheon, as we hope to show in another paper; the original supreme triad consisted of the Thunderer *Teišebā*, his wife *Hubā* and their son, the child-god,²¹ *Turā* (= Hurr. *Tilla*). Among important Urartian deities must be counted *Huṣuine* (the name is an epithet; it may have some connection with the Hurrian goddesses of the fates, the *Hudena* and the *Hudellura*), *Ua* (who may be the Mesopotamian

¹⁹G. A. Melikišvili, *Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi* [*Urartian Cuneiform Inscriptions*], Moscow 1960, No 27 (the inscription Mheridur, or Meher-kapusī, or Taš-kapusī).

²⁰B. B. Piotrovskij, *Vanskoe carstvo* [*The Kingdom of Van*], Moscow 1959, p. 224 sq.; G. A. Melikišvili, "Die Götterpaartrias an der Spitze des urartäischen Pantheon," *Orientalia* 34,4 (1965), pp. 441-45.

²¹*Turā* gets a much smaller "food ration" (offering) than his neighbors on the list, although he precedes them.

Ēia?),²² *Nālaine* (the god of the Nāla Mountains, or the Armenian Taurus), the Moon-god *Šelarde*, the chthonic(?) god *Querā*, the god *Eliwre*; all these are mentioned also in other inscriptions besides the general list of deities, where they, however, are named nearer to the end; the goddess *Sarde* may be a form of *Ištar*. The considerable difference from the pantheons of the Hurrians proper is obvious. Except *Teišebā* = *Teššob* and his triad, the deities are foreign to the latter.

IIIa. *Arraphe*:²³ the goddess *Šawuška* is not mentioned, either in the documents or in the theophorous names. Therefore the often encountered ideograms ⁴*IŠTAR*, ⁴*U* must in most cases denote either the Akkadian *Ištar*, or else the Hurrian *Heba*, abundantly attested in the PNs.²⁴ In *Āl-ilāni*, the capital of *Arraphe*, there seems to have been four sanctuaries: for *Teššob*, for "*Ištar, the Lady of the Land*" (or: "*the World*")=*Heba*?, for *Ištar Silakku*, and possibly for *Ištar of Nineveh*. Judging from the wall-painting in the palace sanctuary at Nuzi,²⁵ the three most important deities were imagined in the guise of a bull, a cow and a calf. The bull is certainly identical with *Teššob*, hence the cow with *Heba*, the most popular of the goddesses on the evidence of the PN repertory, the calf probably with *Tilla*, who is second only to *Teššob* in his popularity in forming theophorous names. The identification of *Tilla* with the Urartian child-god *Ṭurā* is linguistically feasible.²⁶ It is the minority of *Tilla* which probably explains why he had no sanctuary of his own either in the capital, *Āl-ilāni*, or in Nuzi; such a sanctuary existed, along with some others, only in the community of *Ulamme*.

In Nuzi, the second in importance among the communities of *Arraphe*, were worshipped *Teššob* of *Ḫalep* (in Syria!), *Ištar* of *Nineveh* (= *Heba*?),

²²We adopt the form *Ēia* rather than *Ea* on the following grounds: 1) there are Hurrian phonetic transcriptions which directly present the spelling *E-i-a*; 2) the spelling ⁴*Ē-a* is Akkadian, not Sumerian, but it is against all Semitic phonetical rules, and consequently must be read in some other way; 3) in Oakk *Ē* is *hà*, *hā*, and *A* (vide *A-a/E-a=A-nāqu*) is to be read, at least in many cases, as */āi(a)/*. Now *Hāi* (and even *Hāia*, since the pre-Oakk, as well as the Amorite absolute form of the nouns ended in *-Ø/-a*) makes perfect sense from the point of view of Semitic linguistics and mythology. In the later period the reading would be */*Ēia/*, as pointed out by the Hurrian phonetic spelling. Whether the Urartian god ⁴*Ū-a* has anything at all to do with the Akkadian *Hāi/Ēia* is another matter.

²³After Deller.

²⁴See *NPN*.

²⁵R. Starr, *Nuzi, II*, Cambridge, Mass., 1937, pl. 129 D.

²⁶The alternation of Hurr. *i* // Urart. *u* is fairly common (v. *HuU*, p. 61), also the alternation of *l* // *r* // *n* (ibid., p. 55). The Common Hurro-Urartian phoneme **l* is preserved in Urartian but *>l* in Hurrian (ibid., pp. 44-45).

probably together with Tilla, and certainly also the Akkadian chthonic(?) goddess Bēlat-ēkalli. The absence of truly local gods is noteworthy.

In Abena, "the Town of the Donkeys," were worshipped the local god Sarie (Sario)²⁷ with his wife the Tupkilian Ištar (or the Akkubian Ištar), and the Akkadian Nergal with his wife Humella. But in another list Nergal is replaced by a god Zarwa(n), before whom is named Azuihhe, a goddess(?), and after Zarwa(n) comes Zari[...] probably his wife; then are listed the god Tirwi(n) and the Sun-god ⁴UTU (to judge from the theophorous PN, *Šimiga*).

In A(h)zuḫina were worshipped the gods *Kurwe* with his wife *Ištar* of Nineveh (from which probably follows that *Kurwe* was a kind of *Teššob*),²⁸ *Kumurwe* (Kumarwe) with his wife *Aḫulae* (an epithet), *Nergal* with his wife *Ištar Humella*, the Akkubian Ištar, the god Tirwi(n) and the Sun-god.

Apart from these, the PN and other data show that, of the more important gods, the Moon-god *Kuṣury*, the chthonic god ⁴U.GUR, *Ēia*, *Ušum*, etc., were also worshipped in Arrapḫe.

Thus, to the common pantheon of the kingdom Arrapḫe belong the following important deities: the Thunderer-god *Teššob* (*Kurwe*) with the consort *Heba* (=Ištar with the different additional characterizations and epithets) and their son *Tilla*, *Kumurwe* (Kumarwe), *Nergal* (Zarwan) with *Ištar Humella*, *Tirwi(n)*, the Sun-god *Šimiga*, the Moon-god *Kuṣury*, ⁴U.GUR, *Ēia*, etc., but not **Šawuška*.

III. *Texts from Mari and North-Eastern Babylonia*.²⁹ In a text from Mari the goddess *Ša²uška*, or *Šawuška*, of the militant Ištar type, is named at the head of the other deities. Then follows a triad consisting of the Akkadian wisdom-god *Ēia*, the Thunderer-god *Teššob* of the town Kumme (=K/Qumme, K/Qumēnu on the Upper Zab rather than Kumme/Kummānu/Comana in Cataonia?), and the Sun-god *Šimije*, or *Šimige*; in another variant the triad consists of the god *Nirae* of Pidena (*nirae* "the swift"; an epithet probably of the same *Teššob*), of *Kumarwe* (probably another god of Kumme), and of *Šimige*. Also mentioned are the Moon-god *Ušum*, the god *Kubli*, etc.

IV. *Kizzuwadna (Cataonia)*. There is one list which is expressly described as an enumeration of the gods of Kizzuwadna, namely, the one in the treaty between Suppiluliumas and Šattiwazza. (The corresponding lists which must have existed in the treaties of the Hittite kings with those of Kizzuwadna have not, to my knowledge, been preserved.) Unfortunately, the treaty in question lists only certain little known, perhaps pre-Hurrian, apparently chthonic

²⁷The alternation of *-i-e/-i-u* points probably to the pronunciation /*ia*/ < /**io*/ . Cf. the numerous cases of the suffix *-i-ū*, probably /*-io*/, in Urartian toponyms, I. M. Diakonoff and S. Kashkay, *Urartu. Répertoire géographique cunéiforme* (in print).

²⁸The ubiquity of Ištar of Nineveh shows that the sending by Dušratta of her statue to the pharaoh does not prove he ruled over Nineveh (much less over all Assyrian cities).

²⁹See nn. 7-8.

deities, then *Alalu* and a group of gods of Akkadian origin, although, according to the myth of Kumarwe, these were connected with *Alalu*: *Anu* and *Antu*, *Enlil* and *Ninlil*, and, without a pair, *Bēlat-ēkalli*; then come the "mountains, rivers, the Tigris, the Euphrates, Heaven and Earth, winds, clouds." We miss Kumarwe himself, and even *Teššob*, and many other gods. It seems that from among the gods of Kizzuwadna only those who seemed especially terrible, namely the chthonic gods and the gods of the earlier generation (they may have been felt to be the same thing), were selected to witness the Mitannian oath. Moreover, a number of the gods of Kizzuwadna, among others the *Hebat*³⁰ of Kizzuwadna, had already been mentioned as witnesses on the Hittite side (see above). On the ground of the representations and Luwian Hieroglyphic inscriptions at Yazılı-kaya we may consider the following three groups of deities as gods of Kizzuwadna: (a) the supreme triad *Teššob*, *Hebat* and their son *Šarruma* (with two sisters?); (b) the twelve great gods: the Thunderer-god of Kumme(?), *Kumarwe*, *Ēia*(?), *Šawuška* (with her servants *Ninatta* and *Kulitta*), the Moon-god *Kužuj*, the Sun-god (= *Šimiga*) and six others (plus *Šeri* and *Hurri* who probably were servant-gods); (c) seven(?) goddesses. Also twelve other gods, the Sword-god (cf. the Weapon-gods in Urartu), etc., etc. Note that *Šawuška* has a place among the gods, not the goddesses.^{30a}

V. *Mitanni*. The list in the Šattiwazza-treaty (after the enumeration of the gods evoked by Š. but foreign to Mitanni proper) gives us probably a rather comprehensive picture of the Mitannian pantheon. It starts with Semitic and therefore probably pre-Mitannian gods of Northern Mesopotamia, beginning with ^dISKUR (meaning Addu? or *Teššob*?), "the Lord of Heaven and Earth"; then come *Šin* and *Šamaš* (in Hurrian probably conceived as *Šimige* and

³⁰It is *Heba* in all PN (and therefore this form is the more archaic) but *Hebat*, *Hebatu* in Boğazköy, in Ugaritic lists, in the Hieroglyphic Luwian texts and elsewhere. E. A. Speiser had pointed out that this *t* does not, contrary to the rules of Hurrian phonetics, develop to **d*, and hence is (a) late, (b) Semitic. He compared West Semitic **Hawwatu*, Hebr. *Hawwā* "Eve." The name cannot be borrowed from West Semitic because, first, the form *Heba* is earlier than the Semitic addition *-t-* (this is, among other proofs, shown by the existence of *Hubā* in Urartian), and second, because intervocalic **b* may develop to West Semitic *b* > /w(w)/, but Semitic **w* cannot be reflected as Hurrian *b*. Of course, cuneiform *b*-signs were frequently enough used for /w/ in Hurrian, but in this case (1) variants with the PI-sign would occur; (2) Urartian *Hubā* would be inexplicable. Therefore, although there may have been an identification of Hurr. *Heba* > *Hebatu* with West Semitic *Hawwā* < *Hawwatu*, either the two mythological figures must have originally been quite separate, or it was *Heba* who was the original. The Semitic etymology of *Hawwā* is not above some suspicions.

^{30a}K. Bittel, "Bildbeschreibung," pp. 125-65; H. G. Güterbock, "Die Inschriften," in: K. Bittel et al., *Das hethitische Felsheiligtum Yazılıkaya*, Berlin 1975. See also V. Haas - M. Wäfler, "Zur Topographie von Hattuša und Umgebung I," *OA* 16 (1977), pp. 227-38 for the history of the controversy and the pertinent bibliography.

Kuṣuy), and separately *Šin of Harrān*, who was to have a long and important history in the Near East. The Mitannian deities proper begin with *Teššob* "the Lord of (the town) Kaḫat." Then follow *Nergal* of Kurda, *Teššob*, Lord of Uḫašuman, *Ēiašarri*, *Anu* and *Antu*, *Enlil* and *Ninlil*; then come the Indo-Iranian gods, protectors of the dynasty(?), then a few local gods, mostly having epithets instead of proper names; last of all comes *Aššur*. His appearance must be due to the political situation in Mitanni at that particular time.

The goddesses are listed separately (except for *Antu* and *Ninlil* who follow their consorts, constituting with them quasi-entities). The list begins with "the Goddess (^d*IS*TAR) of the Star Dilbat" (i.e., the Morning Star). This is, no doubt, *Šawuška*, because no other goddess could presume to stand above *Ḫebat*). Then comes *Sala*, the wife of *Iškur*, or *Addu*; this, of course, is *Ḫeba* masquerading; then *Bēlat-ēkalli* (who here probably is the spouse of *Nergal*), *Damkina* (the wife of *Ēia*, or *Ēiašarri*), *Išhara* (a pre-Hurrian goddess), and then the mountains and the rivers, the gods of Heaven and the gods of Earth. (Note that the mountains come before the rivers, possibly a reminiscence of the origin of the Mitannians in the mountains of the North-East.)

The absence of *Kumarwe* in the list may be fortuitous.

VI. *The Hurrian gods of Ugarit* (lists A, B, C, D and Corpus 166).³¹ At the head of all the lists we find the local Western Semitic god ²*El*, preceded only by "father-gods" (or "the father-god") of the first (dormant) divine generation. ²*El* is followed by *Teššob* of *Ḫalep* and *Kumarwe* (in one of the lists *Kumarwe* precedes *Teššob*—probably not by importance but by seniority), and the Moon-god *Kuṣuy* (in one case preceding *Kumarwe*). Then follows *Ēia*, or *Ēia ḫazizi*,³² and *Aštabi* (in one list the Semitic(?) god *Tadmiš* and another one whose name is not preserved precede *Aštabi*), then, in arbitrary order, follow *Ardi* ("town, community"), *Ḫaman*(?), the Sun-god *Šimige*, *Nubadig* and *Piṣaezaphi* (actually an epithet). One list also mentions the West Semitic god *Rašp*, Hurr. *Irzappa*.

The order in which the goddesses are placed is interesting. The greatest veneration is awarded to *Šawuška*—in most of the lists she is placed directly after *Teššob* and before *Kumarwe*. Also among the male deities but lower down in the list are placed the West Semitic ^c*Anat* and the Akkadian *Nikkal* (*Ningal*, wife of the Mesopotamian Moon-god; being a cow-goddess she may have been assimilated to a Hurrian fertility goddess figure) as well as *Pendigalli* (*Bēlat ēkalli*), and in one list the fate-goddesses *Ḫudena* and *Ḫudellura*. In the

³¹See n. 9.

³²All the various forms of the last word are spelling variants of **ḫazzizzi*; to read /ḫasisi/ or /ḫassissi/, obviously (in spite of A. Kammenhuber's objections) < Akkad. *ḫasīsu* "wisdom." Note that Hurr. **ḫazzizze Madae* is a translation of the Ugaritic Semitic *Kuṣūru wa-Ḫasīsu*. Hence Hurr. **mad-* means "clever, skilful."

lists A and B the other goddesses are enumerated in a batch; in C, D and in Corpus 166 they are left out altogether, except that in the latter *Hebat* is added at the bottom of the list. The goddesses in question are *Hebat*, *Uzḫara* (=Iṣhara), "The Lady" (*Allāne*), the Semitic(?) *Daqqat*, *Hudena* and *Hudellura*, *Ninatta-Kulitta* and *Adamma-Kubaba*.

Nearly all the Hurrian deities of Ugarit appear in the texts of Boğazköy and in Yazılıkaya, the difference being mainly in their apparent seniority.

To sum up:

1) Common to all groups of Hurrians was the cult of the Thunderer-god *Teššob* (Ugart. *Teišebā*) and his spouse *Heba* (Ugart. *Hubā*, in the West, apparently under Semitic influence, *Hebat* or *Hebatu*, but only *Heba* in the PN).³³ The sacred animal of *Teššob* was the bull; his arms were the mace or the battle-ax. The sacred animal of *Heba* was sometimes, though apparently not always, the cow.

2) In some regional pantheons also their son was worshipped, viz., as a god-child or a calf; he was *Tilla* in Arrapḫe, *Turā* in Urartu, *Šarruma* in Cataonia. Already here there is no complete uniformity in the cults of the different Hurrian regions.

3) Significant are the different roles of *Šawuška*. She is absent in the north and in the east (in Urartu and in Arrapḫe). But among the Hurrians of Babylonia she is at the head of the pantheon. In Mitanni she heads the goddesses; here, in the guise of the "Goddess of the Morning Star" she precedes *Šala* (*Heba*). In Ugarit she is second only to ²El and *Teššob*. In Kizzuwadna she follows *Teššob*, *Kumarwe* and *Ēia* among the male gods.

4) It is but natural that the cosmic deities of the Sun and Moon should be worshipped everywhere. But, for one thing, they were worshipped under different names (the Sun-god was *Šiwine* in Urartu, *Šimiga*, etc., in most other regions; the Moon-god was usually but not universally *Kuṣur*, but *Šelarde* in Urartu), and secondly they occupied different ranks in the divine hierarchy: in Urartu, in Kizzuwadna and among the Babylonian Hurrians the Sun-god was one of the most important deities, but he was a secondary figure among the Hurrian gods of the other regions. The Moon-god had an important place in Kizzuwadna, Mitanni and Ugarit but an unimportant one in the other regions.

5) The gods ⁴U.GUR and *Kumarwe* occupy different places in the regional pantheons. However, *Kumarwe* was apparently known in the whole of the Hurrian area; it is a possibility that he was even known in Urartu under some covering epithet. As to ⁴U.GUR, he was at least known in Arrapḫe and in Kizzuwadna (also, e.g., in Haiasa).

6) In some cases local deities (Hurrian, or belonging to the substratum or adstratum) have been pushed to the head of the pantheon, preceding *Teššob* (thus *Ḫaldi* in Urartu, ²El at Ugarit, possibly *Alala/u* in Kizzuwadna).

³³See n. 30.

7) The Akkadian deities are absent in Urartu³⁴ (*Aia* belongs probably to the substratum, and the identity of *Ua* with *Ēia* is very doubtful).³⁵ In the other regions they are present, forming a more or less clear-cut group. To it belong *Ēia* (Ea), usually in the form of *Ēia bēl hašīsi*, *Ēia Ḥazzizzi*, or *Ēiašarri* (*Ēia šarru*), sometimes worshipped together with his spouse; *Nergal*, married to the native *Humella* (or, presumably, to *Bēlat ēkalli?*); *Nikkal* (Ningal, the cow-spouse of the Moon-god); and in the West, *Anu* and *Antu*, *Enlil* and *Ninlil*, etc. This selection points to an influence from Ur and Uruk and perhaps Nippur, more than to that of the more northerly Babylonian communities. The reason for this is not apparent.

8) Indo-Iranian gods were known only in Mitanni (the Arrapḫean *Zarwa(n)* and *Tirwi(n)* are hardly Indo-Iranian).

It is immediately apparent that these "isotheoi" do not directly coincide with the grammatical and syntactical isoglosses as established by Khačikyan. However, this is as should be expected, even the different isoglosses rarely coincide fully. Moreover, the above is not a final study of the very complicated material but only a sketch aiming to show that there are means to find out the ethnic infrastructure of the Hurrians. We have only grazed the surface; much more solid investigation should be done with the material which we have but touched upon (or barely even that). Obviously, much known Hurrian material has been entirely left out of our discussion. The conclusions arrived at in this way cannot but be hypothetical in the highest degree, but better results can certainly be achieved by further research, and this is what we have tried to show.

However, if we are allowed to hypothesize, this is the first approach (subject to later correction) to an historical explanation of the data:

The Hurrians, as their name implies, came to the Fertile Crescent from the East or, to be more precise, from the North-East, probably during the 3rd millennium B.C. The earliest wave of the Hurrian tribal migration was (C), leaving its trace in the textual evidence of the Sumero-Hurrian vocabulary of the *ḤAR-ra* = *hubulhu* type found at Ras-Šamra. This is the unidentified easternmost dialect (VII), very archaic and differing from the other Hurrian dialects in many respects.³⁶ The tribes in question may possibly be identified with the bearers of the Kur-Araxes culture (also called Eastern Anatolian

³⁴However, note that among the gods worshipped in Urartu we most unexpectedly find ^dAMAR.UTU; whether this means the Babylonian Marduk (which seems improbable), or some other god, cannot be decided. See. N. V. Arutjunjan (Harouthiounian), *Novye urartskie nadpisi Karmir-blura* [New Urartian Inscriptions of Karmir-blur], Erevan, 1966, No III, 3, l. 8.

³⁵See n. 22 above.

³⁶Cf. also the epichoric inscription from Lemnos with its predicative forms in *-ai*, *-aiś*, P. Kretschmer, "Die tyrrhenischen Inschriften der Stele von Lemnos," *Glotta* 29 (1942), pp. 96-98.

Early Bronze) who might have brought it in the form of the Khirbet Kerak culture to southern Syria and Palestine; or the dialect may have been that of the "Eteocypriote" population of Alašia-Cyprus, if we are to assume that the latter were linguistically akin to the Hurrians.

The second wave involved tribes belonging mainly to the (A) group (partly to B). It included the speakers of the Urartian dialect who did not leave the Highland, and of the dialect (I), that of Urkiš, which may have been the first Hurrian dialect to reach not only the Upper Tigris valley but also the territory between Upper Mesopotamia north of the Khabur and the Cilician Taurus. The (A) influence seems to have reached Kizzuwadna in the North-West and Arrapḫe in the East. Both dialects (IIIa and IV) belong to the (B) group but differ from the other (B)-dialect regions by the characteristic (A)-cult of the triad Teššob-Ḫeba-Tilla; the latter received in Kizzuwadna the local name Šarruma.

The third wave consisted of the nucleus of the (B) group tribes. Characteristic of it was the cult of Šawuška, the pre-eminence of the Moon-god over the Sun-god, and the absence of the cult of the child- (or the calf-) god. It included, among others, the dialects of the Babylonian Hurrians (III), of Kizzuwadna (IV), and of the Syrian Hurrians of Ugarit (VI). This wave must have invaded all of Northern Mesopotamia before the Mitannians came, and may have flooded Kizzuwadna and Arrapḫe after the (A) wave, hence their (B) type dialects (IV and IIIa). The Boğazköy material is ambiguous and syncretic because of the plural Hurrian influences from over the Taurus and from beyond the Euphrates (e.g., Hitt. *iwāru* is an early Hurrian borrowing).

The last wave of the (B) migration was the coming of the Mitannians (Matieni) from the Lake Urmia region, bringing along some Indo-Iranian glosses and the Indo-Iranian dynastic gods. Their dialect (V) is the most developed in the (B) group and hence the latest. Its speakers created the new dynasty of Ḫanigalbat (from ca. 1600 also called Mitanni) in Northern Mesopotamia.

A more detailed investigation of the pertinent data is needed, and first of all, monographic treatments of the Hurrian linguistic material from Alalaḫ, Amarna, Qatna and especially from Arrapḫe, where such abundant data have been made available by the many years of Professor Lacheman's labor.